USAWC STRATEGY RESEARCH PROJECT

POLAND'S ENGAGEMENT IN THE GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM: STRATEGIC LEVEL POLITICAL AND MILITARY IMPLICATIONS

by

Colonel Janusz Adamczak
Polish Army

Colonel Bob Applegate
Project Adviser

U.S. Army War College
CARLISLE BARRACKS, PENNSYLVANIA 17013

Report Documentation Page

1. REPORT DATE	2. REPORT TYPE	3. DATES COVERED
30 MAR 2007	**Strategy Research Project**	**00-00-2006 to 00-00-2007**

4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE	5a. CONTRACT NUMBER
Poland's Engagement in the Global War on Terrorism Strategic Level Political and Military Implications	5b. GRANT NUMBER
	5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER
6. AUTHOR(S)	5d. PROJECT NUMBER
Janusz Adamczak	5e. TASK NUMBER
	5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER

7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)	8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER
U.S. Army War College,Carlisle Barracks,Carlisle,PA,17013-5050	

9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)	10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)
	11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)

12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited

13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES

14. ABSTRACT

See attached.

15. SUBJECT TERMS

16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT	18. NUMBER OF PAGES	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT **unclassified**	b. ABSTRACT **unclassified**	c. THIS PAGE **unclassified**	**Same as Report (SAR)**	**23**	

ABSTRACT

AUTHOR: Colonel Janusz Adamczak

TITLE: Poland's Engagement in the Global War on Terrorism: Strategic Level Political and Military Implications

FORMAT: Strategy Research Project

DATE: 01 March 2007   WORD COUNT: 7106   PAGES: 23

KEY TERMS: Coalition Operations, Europe.

CLASSIFICATION: Unclassified

The events of September 11 started a new age in the history of the modern world. The attack on the World Trade Center broke some kind of a moral barrier in the way war was waged by worldwide terrorist organizations. World and local leaders realized that there is no safe place on this earth and that terrorists' capabilities had become almost unlimited. Such a situation caused many states to pledge their willingness to support the anti-terrorism coalition lead by the United States. The bombing in Madrid and hijacking of coalition countries' citizens in Iraq faltered the strength of the coalition and has caused some countries to step back. Despite recurrent menaces and over twenty citizens lost in Iraq, Polish policy regarding her involvement in the anti-terrorist coalition remains constant. This paper will examine Polish National Security Strategy and its Homeland Security Policy in response to the growing worldwide terrorism threat. Moreover, it will analyze the advantages and disadvantages of Poland's engagement in the anti-terrorism world coalition and present implications of Polish policy on political- and military-related issues.

POLAND'S ENGAGEMENT IN THE GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM: STRATEGIC LEVEL POLITICAL AND MILITARY IMPLICATIONS

> We will direct every resource at our disposal, every means of diplomacy, every tool of intelligence, every instrument of law enforcement, every financial influence, and every necessary weapon of war to the disruption and eventual defeat of terrorism. Every nation now has a decision to make. Either you are with us, or you are with the terrorists. From this day forward, any nation that harbors or supports terrorism will be regarded as a hostile regime. We will do far more than retaliate. Americans should expect a battle unlike any other they have ever seen, not one battle, but a lengthy campaign, some visible, others secret. We will drive terrorists from place to place until there is no refuge or rest.

> —Presidential Declaration of War on Terrorism[1]

The events of September 11 started a new age in the history of the modern world. Attacks on the World Trade Centre and Pentagon broke some kind of a moral barrier in the way war was waged by worldwide terrorist organizations. The attacks became a turning point in thinking about national and international security. For the United States, it was a shock comparable in rank to the attack on Pearl Harbor during World War II. The world society was stunned by the fact that the strongest, the most powerful country in the world could be attacked in such severity. World and local leaders realized that there is no safe place left on this earth and the terrorists' capabilities had become almost unlimited. September 11 made us realize the extent of change – new realities, threats, and challenges for international and national security in the 21st century. Within a short period of time we found ourselves in a new reality and quickly understood the necessity to take immediate action in order to face these new challenges. Such a situation caused many states to pledge their willingness to support the anti-terrorism coalition lead by the United States.

Poland shared these anxieties and took immediate political and military steps to express its solidarity with the US and disapproval for the flow of terror moving around the globe. The Polish parliament and government almost unanimously took the position to join the anti-terrorism multinational coalition. Polish President Aleksander Kwasniewski initiated, and Poland hosted, an international conference of regional leaders whose main goal was to create new ways in combating terrorism. Polish soldiers, from the very beginning, have participated in military operations against Tallibs in Afghanistan and Saddam Hussein's regime in Iraq and they continue their mission by taking part in stability operations in both countries.

The bombing in Madrid and hijacking of coalition countries' citizens in Iraq faltered the strength of the coalition and has caused some countries to step back. Despite recurrent

menaces and over twenty citizens lost in Iraq, Polish policy regarding her involvement in the anti-terrorist coalition remains constant. Also, this policy has been reflected in a new Polish National Security Strategy published in 2003. This document recognizes new threats for global and local security and formulates Polish security policy to face them.

The purpose of this paper is to examine Polish National Security Strategy and its Homeland Security Policy in response to the growing worldwide terrorism threat. Moreover, it will analyze the advantages and disadvantages of Poland's engagement in the anti-terrorism world coalition and present implications of Polish policy on political- and military-related issues.

<u>What is Terrorism</u>

Terrorism is not a new occurrence, and even though it has been used since the beginning of recorded history it is relatively hard to define. Terrorism is being described variously as both a tactic and strategy; a crime and a holy duty; a justified reaction to oppression and an inexcusable abomination. Obviously, a lot depends on whose point of view is being represented. Terrorism has often been an effective tactic for the weaker side in a conflict. Due to the secret nature and small size of terrorist organizations, they often offer opponents no clear organization to defend against or to deter.

Defining Terrorism

Politicians and scientists of different states have explored the quest for a definition of terrorism for decades. The international community struggles with this problem and as of now the United Nations has no internationally agreed upon definition of terrorism. Moreover, even single states have a problem to unequivocally define this occurrence. Within the US Government, agencies responsible for different functions in the fight against terrorism use different definitions. The United States Department of Defense defines terrorism as "the calculated use of unlawful violence or threat of unlawful violence to inculcate fear; intended to coerce or to intimidate governments or societies in the pursuit of goals that are generally political, religious, or ideological."[2] The FBI uses this: "Terrorism is the unlawful use of force and violence against persons or property to intimidate or coerce a government, the civilian population, or any segment thereof, in furtherance of political or social objectives."[3] The U.S. Department of State defines terrorism as a "premeditated politically-motivated violence perpetrated against non-combatant targets by sub-national groups or clandestine agents, usually intended to influence an audience."[4]

After a quick research of Polish governmental documents it is easy to recognize that there is not any common definition of terrorism and usually all sources refer to Polish Scientific Publishers – PWN, which describes terrorism as:

> different motivated, usually ideological, planned and coordinated activities of separate individuals or groups of people taken against existing rules of law to extort an anticipated action or behavior… Activities conducted with different means (physical force, lethal weapon, psychological pressure) and with absolute inexorability oriented to gain fame and/or create the fear of society.[5]

Perhaps the most complex description of terrorism is the Academic Consensus Definition which states that:

> Terrorism is an anxiety-inspiring method of repeated violent action, employed by (semi-) clandestine individual, group or state actors, for idiosyncratic, criminal or political reasons, whereby - in contrast to assassination - the direct targets of violence are not the main targets. The immediate human victims of violence are generally chosen randomly (targets of opportunity) or selectively (representative or symbolic targets) from a target population, and serve as message generators. Threat- and violence-based communication processes between terrorist (organization), victims, and main targets are used to manipulate the main target (audience(s)), turning it into a target of terror, a target of demands, or a target of attention, depending on whether intimidation, coercion, or propaganda is primarily sought.[6]

Despite the diverse interpretation of terrorism, there will always be six basic components to terrorist activities. Terrorism is (1) an intentional and (2) rational (3) act of violence to (4) cause fear (5) in the target audience or society (6) for the purpose of changing behavior in that audience or society. Terrorism is a political act, the goal of which is to make a change.

Brief History of Terrorism

As it was mentioned before, terrorism is not a new occurrence. It is impossible to learn when it was first used, however historical records of terrorist-like activities take us back almost 2000 years. Over the past twenty centuries, terrorism has been used for various reasons to achieve various goals. Terrorism has been used by religious zealots and by non-religious ideologues.

Terrorism is nothing new in the Middle East and its use is not new to Jews or Muslims. Jewish Zealots used terrorism to resist the Romans and Muslims used terrorism to resist each other (i.e. Shiites vs Sunni) and against the Christian crusades. Terror during this period was used to kill religious enemies. Practically from the beginning, terrorism and religion went together. The concept of Suicide Martyrdom, dying in the service of God - dying while killing the enemies of God - dates back more than a thousand years[7].

Modern terrorism began with the Reign of Terror introduced by Maximilien Robespierre and the Jacobin Party (late 18th century). Robespierre used terror systematically to suppress opposition to the government. He introduced Government-sponsored terrorism: the use of terror to maintain power and suppress rivals. Before his reign was over, thousands of people were executed putting their heads into the guillotine.

During the late 19th and early 20th century in Eastern Europe anarchists developed a movement using varying types of terrorist tactics. The Anarchists believed that killing kings and nobles of Europe would bring down governments. At that time anarchists introduced so-called individual terrorism, which was the use of selective terror against an individual or group in order to bring down a government. Terrorist acts however, were limited to ensure that innocent people were not hurt. Anarchists also observed that terrorism has a communicative effect. When a bomb explodes, society asks why.

Later on in Soviet Russia, communist leaders (Lenin and Stalin) expanded the idea of government-sponsored terrorism as a tool to maintain governmental control. Both used terror against an entire class of people within society systematically. Fear was used as a motivational factor for governmental operations and public compliance with government. Terror was used as a way to organize and control a society.

The Irish War (1919-1921) brought three concepts to the development of terrorism (1) selective terrorism, (2) sustained terror over time and (3) cell operations. Irish terrorists directed their actions against deliberately chosen representatives of England (police, soldiers, judges, government officials, etc.) in an effort to make the cost of continued occupation too high to maintain. Another terrorist strategy was focused on changing of a society. The acts of terror must be sustained over a long period of time which will, over time, break down the will of the targeted government. The Irish war also provided the concept of cell operation to terrorism. Cell operation decentralizes the implementation of terrorist acts and prevents the discovery and destruction of the terrorist organization. Terrorist groups like Al-Qaeda operated with this decentralized design to implement the attack on September 11th.

After WWII terrorism became a tool for liberation and for ending colonialism in the Third World, mostly in Africa and Asia. Selective terror changed from targeting government officials to civilians and sympathizers of occupants.

The 1960's brought to terrorism an international scope and a focus on the Middle East. With the 1967 war in which Israel defeated Jordan, Egypt and Syria, the use of conventional war as a means to destroy Israel was not sufficient and the use of terror with the purpose of focusing attention on Israeli-Palestinian problem began. Also Europe suffered from terrorist activity as

European and Middle Eastern terrorist groups worked together to bring attention to the Palestinian cause.

As the Cold War escalated in the 1960's and the world became polarized between the East and the West, a new dynamic was added to terrorism and the state-sponsored and international terrorism developed. Governments sponsored terrorism in other parts of the world for their own political interests; i.e. Iran supported Hizballah[8], Libia supported Abu Nidal[9]. Some other countries (i.e. Iraq, Cuba, Sudan and Algeria) provided training camps as well as economic and political support to different terrorist groups.

The 1970's were the decade of air terrorism with more than 20 events of terrorism directed at European and American airlines involving hijacking, bombing, and hostage taking. The 1970's also involved bombings, kidnappings and other types of terrorist activity throughout Europe.

The last two decades of the 20th century brought terrorism ideology to its religious roots. Militant Islam and the protection of Islam against Jews, Christians, and the West formed an independent justification for terrorism. Suicide attacks committed in the name of Allah by Islamic extremists became a basic tactic of radical terrorist organizations.

The turn of the 20th and 21st centuries brought another change to the development of terrorism. The 1990's brought to terrorism indiscriminate killing and high mass casualty counts for its own sake. The 1990's returned to terrorism religious extremism, and hate being enough to justify the use of terror. For almost two thousand years, terrorism has changed and has been used for a variety of different purposes to achieve various goals.

The Nature of Terrorism

Terrorism is a criminal act that influences an audience beyond the immediate victim. The strategy of terrorists is to commit acts of violence that draws the attention of the local populace, the government, and the world to their cause. The terrorists plan their attack to obtain the greatest publicity, choosing targets that symbolize what they oppose. The effectiveness of the terrorist act lies not in the act itself, but in the public or government's reaction to the act. There are three perspectives of terrorism: the terrorist's, the victim's, and the general public's perspective.[10] The phrase "one man's terrorist is another man's freedom fighter" is a view terrorists themselves would accept. Terrorists do not see themselves as evil. They believe they are legitimate combatants, fighting for what they believe in, by whatever means possible. A victim of a terrorist act sees the terrorist as a criminal with no regard for human life. The general public's view is the most unstable. The terrorists take great pains to foster a "Robin Hood"

image in hope of swaying the general public's point of view toward their cause. This sympathetic view of terrorism has become an integral part of their psychological warfare and needs to be countered vigorously.

Terrorist acts are committed as a result of extremist ideology which, very often is driven by religious beliefs. Ideology and motivation will influence the objectives of terrorist operations, especially regarding the casualty rate. Groups with secular ideologies and non-religious goals will often attempt highly selective and discriminate acts of violence to achieve a specific political aim. This often requires them to keep casualties at the minimum amount necessary to attain the objective. In contrast, religiously oriented groups typically attempt to inflict as many casualties as possible. Because of the apocalyptic frame of reference they use, loss of life is irrelevant, and more casualties are better.

The type of target selected will often reflect motivations and ideologies. For groups professing secular political or social motivations, their targets are highly symbolic of authority; government offices, banks, national airlines, and multinational corporations having a direct relationship to the established order. While religious groups also use much of this symbolism, there is a trend to connect it to greater physical devastation.

Also the Intent of terrorist activities can very. Terrorist groups commit acts of violence to:

- Produce widespread fear;
- Obtain worldwide, national, or local recognition for their cause by attracting the attention of the media;
- Harass, weaken, or embarrass government security forces so that the government overreacts and appears repressive;
- Steal or extort money and equipment, especially weapons and ammunition vital to the operation of their group;
- Destroy facilities or disrupt lines of communication in order to create doubt that the government can provide for and protect its citizens;
- Discourage foreign investments, tourism, or assistance programs that can affect the target country's economy and support of the government in power;
- Influence government decisions, legislation, or other critical decisions;
- Free prisoners;
- Satisfy vengeance;
- Turn the tide in a guerrilla war by forcing government security forces to concentrate their efforts in urban areas what allows the terrorist group to establish itself among the local populace in rural areas;[11]

Terrorism in Poland

Looking at chronicles and statistics Poland seems to be free of terrorism. For decades there has not been any terrorist attack committed on the territory of Poland or against Polish citizens abroad. Separated acts of terror occurring in this country have had a character of ordinary crime and were committed by criminals or mentally ill individuals. Moreover, before 9/11 the overall assessment of a terrorist threat for Poland was very low. Such assessment caused previous Polish governments to pay little attention to the problem focusing instead on routine procedures and activities against likely criminal acts[12]. Also internally Poland was, and still is, very stable. Poland is a homogeneous country with only 3% of foreign ethnic citizens. There has not been an indication of possible hostile activities of any minority group in the country.

September 11 and Poland's declaration of joining the international coalition against terrorism brought Poland into play. There still has not been any terrorist attack against Poland and its citizens; however the estimated level of threat increased. Poland not only appeared on terrorists' list of potential targets but also there were new evidences of international terrorists planning and preparing their operations against targets in Poland.

Poland's Engagement in Anti-Terrorism Coalition

Diplomacy

On September 11, 2001 the whole world was holding its breath while watching the tragedy in New York and Washington DC. Within several days following the attack almost every nation in the world expressed its solidarity with the United States and condemned those terrible acts of terror committed by international terrorist organization led by Osama Bin Laden. Many nations announced their support to the US in its war against terrorism by declaring participation in an anti-terrorist coalition. Poland was among the first countries condemning those unimaginable terrorist attacks. On the same day in his statement, broadcasted by all public and commercial TV and radio channels, Polish President Aleksander Kwasniewski declared full support to the US and President Bush.

> This is the time to say that we commiserate with the families, friends and loved ones of the victims, because there must be very many victims. At the same time – and I want to emphasize this as the President of the Republic of Poland – we are all the way with the American nation, authorities of the United States, and with President Bush in any action he will take against international terrorism. There shall be no consent, nowhere and never, to such acts, such an aggression, such a violation of the fundamental rights. I want to make this very clear in my own name and – as I firmly believe – on behalf of my fellow-Poles.[13]

As history shows, this was not an empty declaration. Since that time Poland has become a very active member of the anti-terrorist coalition supporting it with both political and military means. Polish diplomacy, with a very active personal engagement of President Kwasniewski, has supported numerous initiatives taken by the UN, NATO, and Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE). At the same time a bilateral relationship with the US became tightened. As a result of its regional aspiration in Central- and Eastern Europe, Poland worked actively to co-ordinate activities as an anti-terrorist coalition member.

One of the first diplomatic efforts taken by Poland was an organization of the International Conference for Combating Terrorism. On November 6, 2001, the heads of states from Central-, Eastern-, and South-Eastern Europe met in Warsaw to discuss the problem of international security and work out the strategy for fighting terrorism. In a common declaration, all participants again condemned terrorist attacks. As a result of that conference a number of security initiatives, as well as a plan for combating terrorism, were proposed.

Being a member of the United Nations since 1945, Poland recognizes its special role in maintaining peace and security in the world. The September 11 events caused that the purpose of the United Nations:

> To maintain international peace and security, and to that end: to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace[14]

earned a new dimension. New types of threats caused by non-state actors became one of the most important security issues of the modern world. By the end of 2006 Poland ratified 12 of 13 UN anti-terrorist conventions.[15] Poland has also supported an initiative of preparation of the *Global Strategy to Counter Terrorism* and the *Comprehensive Convention on International Terrorism*.

A special role in this difficult time has been given to bilateral relations with the US. Since the *iron curtain* has collapsed Poland turned its eyes to the west looking for new partners and balancing its relations between Western Europe and the US. The 21st century however brought new quality into the Polish-American partnership. America became the number one strategic partner for Poland in the area of political, economical, and military co-operation. Poland appeared to be a loyal ally of the United States and an active member of the anti-terrorist coalition.

Military Involvement

A substantial portion of the Polish support is the participation of Polish Armed Forces (PL AFs) in wars against Talibs in Afghanistan and Saddam Hussein's regime in Iraq and the following security and stability operations (SASO). Initially, the number of Polish troops deployed to Afghanistan and Iraq was relatively low. In spring of 2002 Poland sent to Afghanistan about 100 soldiers (Special Forces and an engineering element) as a part of the US led Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF). Since 2004 about 10 Polish officers have served in the NATO led headquarters of the International Security Assistance Forces (ISAF).

In spring of 2003, in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom (OIF), Poland initially deployed a 183 men contingent consisting of SF (GROM), NBC platoon, and logistic support ship (ORP Xwery Czernicki). From those forces only GROM took an active part in combat operations securing Iraqi oil platforms in the Gulf. In April 2003 Poland accepted the US proposition to take responsibility for one of four sectors in post-war Iraq and to lead a multinational division conducting SASO in an assigned sector. In September, the Multinational Division Central-South (MND CS) achieved operational readiness and handed over its area of responsibility from Marine Expeditionary Forces (MEF). Twenty-four nations contributed their troops to the Polish led division with an initial strength reaching 10,000 soldiers, including 2,500 Poles. At the beginning the MND CS conducted purely stabilizing tasks. The mission was "to establish a secure environment in the AOR for future economic and social development". As part of their mission, our soldiers assisted in the organization of local administration and security structures. They performed reconstruction work but mostly they were engaged in operational tasks connected with counterinsurgency and peace keeping. The situation in Iraq had been developing since the MND CS was established. The development caused an evolution of the division's mission. The mission character is gradually evolving from stabilization to an advising and training profile. Growing efficiency of Iraqi security forces and resulting changes in MND CS tasks created conditions for troop reductions. Currently, the main focus of the division is on training of the 8th Iraqi Army Division and security forces - Iraqi Police and Iraqi Border Police. Currently MND CS has 13 national contingents in its structure.

The year 2007 will bring no change in Polish policy regarding its participation in the anti-terrorist coalition. In December 2006 President Lech Kaczynski extended the mission of Polish soldiers in Iraq. Moreover, based on a recommendation of Council of Ministers, the President accepted an enlargement of the Polish contingent in Afghanistan up to 1,200 soldiers[16].

Public Opinion

Poland's engagement in the Global War on Terrorism is significant in comparison with most of Europe or even the world community and in general, Polish public opinion supports it. However, a closer look at statistical data provided by various research institutes show that Poles are divided in their opinions and what seems to be more important, they have a different opinion than the Polish government. In September 2001, right after the attack on the World Trade Center, 51% of all responders agreed that Poland can be an object of such attacks and 77% concurred that Poland should fulfill its allied obligations and participate in a NATO military response. Three months later that number dropped to 45%.[17]

Poles thought differently about the American intervention in Iraq. Before the war started, no more than 30% voted in favor of an invasion. In May 2003 more than 50% supported coalition operation and the same percentage of responders agreed with the idea that Poland should increase its military presence in Iraq and take responsibility for one of the sectors during the stability phase. That high level of acceptance did not last long and for the next three years support has been maintained at the level of 20-30%.[18]

Another important conclusion is that based on public opinion, the level of terrorist threat is permanently increasing and in June 2006 more than 80% of Poles were afraid of a possible terrorist attack against Poland.[19]

National Security Strategy

The National Security Policy of a free and democratic Poland is characterized by the constancy of its enduring principles and goals. It has assured Poland of a historically exceptional security standard based on, among other things, North Atlantic Treaty membership[20]. But the international situation has been going through a dynamic change. New challenges and risks have been arising, their extent being starkly revealed in the tragic events in the USA in September 2001. Security determinants have also been changing along the way.

The current Polish National Security Strategy, issued in 2003, is the third document of that type since Poland regained its sovereignty in 1989. In a general scope, this document is a continuation of previous strategies issued in 1992 and 2000. It is based on the same general assumptions and threat assessment.

The fundamental security policy objectives of Poland invariably encompass the safeguarding of Poland's sovereignty and independence, border inviolability and territorial integrity. The State policy promotes security of its citizens, human rights and fundamental freedoms, democratic order, stable conditions for Poland's civilizational and economic progress,

well-being of the people, protection of national heritage and national identity, implementation of allied commitments, defense capability and interests of the Polish State. (przypis – NSS). Poland wants to contribute to building an enduring, just and peaceful order in Europe and throughout the world, developing a system of co-operation founded on democratic principles, human rights, the rule of law, and solidarity.

What makes the new document different than the previous ones is an understanding of threat assessment, or to be more specific, prioritization of current threats. The changes in our security environment essentially shift from the classical risks (armed invasion) that decrease in importance towards the unconventional risks that originate also with hardly identifiable non-state entities. The major security challenges are currently caused by international terrorism and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, as well as the unpredictable policies of authoritarian regimes and the phenomenon of "failed states", which largely exacerbate the risks of international terrorism and the spread of weapons of mass destruction.

The new strategy clearly defines that organized international terrorism is the most serious risk to the international system and the security of individual states, including Poland. A high priority is also given to uncontrolled proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and the means of their delivery which may cause a threat to individual states, whole regions and also, under specific circumstances, the entire global system. Several states are pushing ahead with weapons of mass destruction capability and rocketry programs that in the years to come can put Poland's territory within range of non-Europe-based ballistic missiles. This risk is connected with the increasing likelihood of terrorist and criminal organizations' appropriating such weapons and their means of delivery.

These factors are mainly shaping Poland's policy of active engagement in the maintenance of international peace and security on both a regional and global scale. Polish engagement in the stabilization process in Iraq is an expression of Poland's readiness to play a responsible international role. The taking up of the stabilization role in Iraq enhances Poland's international standing and the due execution of the mission entrusted to us will add to Poland's prestige and image as a responsible and dependable partner on the international scene. At the same time, Poland remains aware of the fact that its active role in the antiterrorist coalition may expose it to the risk of attacks and other hostile acts by groups on which the international community has declared war.

Apart from a properly shaped foreign policy, Polish NSS recognizes the importance of an internal security apparatus which includes armed forces, special services, the police, border guard, civil defense as well as other non-military public services and institutions[21]. The

effectiveness of the security strategy depends on the congruent interoperation of all State institutions, bodies of State authority and administration in accordance with the powers and responsibilities assigned to them by the Polish Constitution and law. These institutions and bodies must face the task of adequately adapting their working methods to the new security challenges.

Political Implications of Poland's Engagement in GWOT

The decisions of the Polish government to engage in the anti-terrorism coalition and to support the US in its global war on terrorism were made in compliance with present Polish national security policy. Poles recognized the global threat caused by international terrorist organizations and despite the fact that Poland had not been directly targeted by any terrorist attack, our country took immediate political and military steps to express its solidarity with the United States. Such decisions resulted not only in increased threats to Poland's security, but also have resulted in a number of secondary effects regarding political relations with other countries. The major impact can be seen in Poland's relations with key NATO and European Union (EU) members such as France and Germany, bilateral relations with the US, and also, indirectly, with Russia.

Relations with European Countries

Being a member of NATO has guaranteed Poland's security after the collapse of the old political system in Eastern and Central Europe. NATO's eastward enlargement meant a change to Poland's geo-political position. Joining the North Atlantic Treaty Organization on March 12, 1999 was one of the most significant events in contemporary Polish history. Poland became part of the allied system of defense, which not only guarantees security and creates stable conditions for development, but is responsible for world peace as well. Membership in the EU (May 1, 2004) was another important step in building Poland's secure and stable position in Europe.

The engagement in the Iraqi conflict and Poland's pro-American posture caused a wave of criticism of our country by European powers; mainly France and Germany. Poland was seen as an American "Trojan Horse" in Europe[22]. A strong critique of American intervention in Iraq expressed by German Chancellor Gerhard Schroeder as well as an arrogant statement by French President Jacques Chirac directed toward new EU members supporting the US ("they did not take their chance to be quiet") caused the EU and European parts of NATO to be divided into two blocks. Of course there are also some other political issues in Polish-French and Polish-German relations beyond Poland's support to the US's war on terror.

France, tending to play a key role in the European political scene, could not accept a strong American influence in the region and was seeking to strengthen European political, economical, and military structures. Poland has presented a different vision than France regarding European security policy. For the last decade, France has insisted on building European Security Forces independent from NATO, while Poland has opposed any security initiatives which would result in an alternative to NATO. In 2004, another fact caused French dissatisfaction and cooled Polish-French relations. The day after Poland formally became a member of the EU, the Polish government announced the decision to purchase American F-16s rather that French MIRAGE or Swedish GRIPEN. This selection caused another wave of discussion about Poland's pro-American orientation.

However, much better relations were maintained by Poland with its western neighbor – Germany. Despite a stormy history and still fresh memories of World War II, Polish-German relations in the 1990s seemed to be very good. Germany was one of the countries that strongly supported Polish aspirations to become a member of NATO and the EU. German Armed Forces made a great effort to support Poland on its way into NATO. Political and economical cooperation brought benefits to both sides. Our relations had remained good even after 9/11 when Poland and Germany, like other European countries, supported America's war against the Tallibs in Afghanistan. Things began to change when President Bush decided to attack Iraq. Germany was one of the first countries criticizing that decision and looked around Europe for supporters. However, Poland remained a constant ally of the US and even increased its contribution to the anti-terrorist coalition. As mentioned before, such a situation created two blocks in the "old continent" with most well developed and old EU members on one side, and all new members as well as some western European countries (i.e. UK, Spain, Italy) on the other side.

What did this mean for Polish-German relations? At first, German public opinion, inspired by Chancellor Schroeder and fostered by the German media, created a picture of Poland as an American "Trojan Horse" in Europe. More significantly, Germany tightened its relations with Russia. This second issue became the major point of concern for Poland regarding its energy security. Russia remains the major oil and natural gas supplier to most European countries. Poland imports about 90% of oil and over 70% of natural gas[23], most from Russia via land based pipelines leading from Russia through Belarus and further also to Germany and other western European countries. Germany and Russia agreed to build a new pipeline to satiate increasing demand for energy in Europe. Despite heavy diplomatic efforts by the Polish government to stick with the original concept of building the pipeline through Ukrainian and

Polish territories, German and Russian leaders decided to change the route and regardless of higher costs, bypass Poland and install the pipeline on the bottom of the Baltic Sea. Such a decision will divest Poland of a transit fee but, more importantly, Russia will gain even better possibilities to "manipulate" oil supply to central Europe[24].

In sum, Poland's relations with European countries are driven by many political, economical, cultural, and historical factors; however there is no doubt that close Polish-American relations throughout the last decade should be seen as one of the major factor shaping our political posture on the European scene.

Relations with the USA

Studying Polish National Security Strategy and other political documents, as well as declarations of political leaders, it is easy to identify three major pillars of Polish foreign policy: (1) membership in NATO, (2) membership in the EU, and (3) bilateral relations with the US. Poland used to perceive the US as one of its top strategic political, economical, and military partners. Its engagement in anti-terrorist coalition made these relations even closer, placing the US on the top of a strategic partners' list. Such close relations with the US are commonly accepted by all political parties as well as public opinion. The list of advantages here is very long and contains among others:

- Solid security guarantees;
- Economic cooperation;
- Financial support;
- Military cooperation and support;
- Increased authority of Poland on the international scene.

It would be difficult to find somebody objecting to these advantages, however, there are still many Poles claiming that Poland deserved more, pointing to unsolved issues of entry visas to the US for Polish citizens, relatively low benefits of our participation in economic development in Iraq, or perturbations with offsets connected with the F-16 program. These topics are ongoing issues and it is expected that they will be resolved in the near future.

Recently, two more issues related to Polish-American relations have been brought to the attention of world public opinion. The first one is the problem of secret CIA's detention facilities which are believed to be located in Poland, Romania, and some other European countries. That topic became an issue in the EU Council and is being investigated by a special commission. The second controversial problem relates to the US Anti-Ballistic Missile Shield,

some elements of which are to be located in Poland. This particular situation creates additional tension in relations with Russia.

Poland's relations with the US are and very likely will continue to be very good. For some countries, Poland will remain an American "Trojan Horse" in Europe; however this characteristic does not reflect truly our political reality. Having lessons learned from the past and being located between Germany and Russia, the Polish government must seek solid security guarantees for its citizens. The EU is still driven more by national interests of particular states than the common idea of a unified Europe. The EU is also not able to replace NATO's collective defense capabilities. A close alliance with the US, which is also a leading power in NATO, continues to fulfill Poland's requirement for regional security.

Military Implications of Poland's Engagement in GWOT

Since the end of WW II, the Polish Armed Forces (PL AFs) have had no possibilities to conduct operations in a war time environment and to develop based upon lessons learned from any active participation in an armed conflict. Even during the Cold War, a 500,000 men strong army had been developed and trained based on its experiences from past wars or, indirectly, by studying and analyzing modern armed conflicts. The first years of the 21st century changed that situation radically. There has been no need for Polish soldiers to exercise their combat skills; however military operations in Afghanistan and Iraq brought them very close to a real war environment. It is worth mentioning that among the three services of the PL AFs, the Army has made the biggest effort contributing with its troops in OEF and OIF, with rather symbolic participation of the Navy and the Air Force. Another important fact is that based on Polish law, all military contingents sent abroad must consist of volunteers. That regulation creates some challenges in terms of personnel management, force generation, and training. For over five years about 15,000 Polish soldiers have participated in stability and security operations in both countries; twenty of them have lost their lives and almost one hundred were injured.

Such a big effort resulted in tremendous changes to the Polish Armed Forces. Those changes can be seen in three major areas: (1) structure, equipment, and capabilities; (2) Tactics, Techniques, and Procedures (TTPs) and training; and what seems to be the most important (3) the way Polish political and military leaders think about requirements, capabilities, and tasks assigned to the PL AFs.

From the very beginning the participation of Polish troops in OEF and OIF has been carefully observed and analyzed by senior civil and military leaders looking for any possible lessons learned from participation in those conflicts. As a direct effect of those analyses the

Polish Army has begun a transformation process which has been connected with an introduction of new types of vehicles and weapon systems for Army units. Some mechanized infantry battalions have received new wheeled Armored Personnel Carriers (APCs) *PATRIA* and two types of High Mobility Multipurpose Wheeled Vehicles (HMMWVs) – American *HUMMER* and Polish *SCORPION*. With this equipment, infantry units became lighter, much more mobile and deployable. Soldiers received new elements of individual equipment (sniper rifles, flak jackets, night vision devices, uniforms, and other) which made them more capable and effective warriors. In addition, the Polish Army has initiated several other modernization programs which include: air- and ground-based reconnaissance and surveillance systems, utility helicopters, Anti-Tank Guided Missiles (ATGMs), and satellite communication assets.

Other changes can be observed in the area of TTPs and training of troops. Based on lessons learned, new doctrines and field manuals have been compiled and introduced for the Army. In the late 1990s the scope of troop training focused mainly on Major Combat Operations (MCOs) during classic armed conflicts. Presently, much more attention is paid to non-linear combat operations, security and stability operations, as well as Disaster Relief and Humanitarian Assistance operations conducted within our own territory or in the framework of allied or coalition operations.

Obviously, the participation of Polish troops in OEF and OIF and following that tremendous transformation of the armed forces takes a lot of financial and material resources which are mostly paid by the Ministry of Defense budget with limited additional support flowing from government financial reserves. An important contribution to the transformation comes from Polish American military cooperation. Being included in the American Department of Defense Foreign Military Financing (FMF) program, Poland receives financial and material support. A big portion of that support covers our participation in operations in Afghanistan and Iraq.

None of those changes would be possible without an acceptance and support provided by political and military leaders. A rapid development of the armed forces is a result of Polish national security and foreign policies reflected in the National Security and Military Strategies of the Republic of Poland. This policy initiated by previous president Aleksander Kwasniewski and the former government is being continued by president Lech Kaczynski and the present Polish government. Mutual understanding and close cooperation of civil and military strategy makers allowed to define new requirements, capabilities, and tasks for PL AFs which translated into the intensive transformation program should result in creating modern and capable forces. Those forces, apart from their homeland defense function, have become an important tool in Polish foreign policy of an active engagement in global security.

Summary

The purpose of this paper was to examine Polish National Security Strategy and its Homeland Security Policy in response to the growing worldwide terrorism threat. Presented analyses of Poland's engagement in the anti-terrorism world coalition and its political and military implications show that it is a very complicated problem our country must deal with. There is not an unequivocal answer to the question: should Poland engage in GWOT? Presented analyzes show both advantages and disadvantages of Poland's engagement in GWOT. The list of advantages includes:

- Increased position of Poland on international scene;
- Very good bilateral relations with the US resulting in political and economical benefits;
- Well developed and profitable for Poland military cooperation with American Armed Forces;
- Tremendous transformation of PL AFs;

From the other hand, there are also some disadvantages coming from that policy. Those drawbacks can be stated in two major points:

- Tense relations with major European players (Germany, Russia, France);
- Increased level of terrorist threat against Poland.

Both groups of argument are very strong and depending on one's point of view, they could be considered differently. Of course Poland must care about its relations with European partners. Poland must also be worried about the threat international terrorism causes for its security. However, as a former Polish Foreign Minister, Wlodzimierz Cimoszewicz said: "passivity is not a solution"[25]. Poland can not remain passive. Supporting the global fight, Poland contributes to global and regional stability and security. Supporting the global fight, Poland ensures its national interests and its external security.

Endnotes

[1] George W. Bush, *Presidential Declaration of War on Terrorism* (part of the President's addresses in front of US Congress, 20 September 2001).

[2] Department of Defense Directive 2000.12, *"DoD Antiterrorism/Force Protection (AT/FP) Program,"* (DoD, April 1999), 23.

[3] Organization of the Department of Justice, *"Code of Federal Regulations, Title 28—Judicial Administration"*. (2001).

[4] Ross J. I. *Political Terrorism: An Interdisciplinary Approach*. (Peter Lang Publishing, 2006), 4

[5] Polish Scientific Publishers – PWN. *http://encyklopedia.pwn.pl/lista.php?co=terrorism*

[6] Schmid A. P. *Political terrorism: A research guide to concepts, theories, data bases, and literature.* (COMT-Publication, 1983), 111.

[7] Laqueur Walter, *A history of terrorism*. (Transaction Publishers, 2001), 74.

[8] Hezbollah (meaning - party of God) is a Shi'a Islamic militia and political and paramilitary organization based in Lebanon. It follows a distinct version of Islamic Shi'a ideology developed by Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini, leader of the Islamic Revolution in Iran.

[9] Abu Nidal Organization is an international terrorist group led by Sabri al-Banna. It split from PLO in 1974. The group was based and had close ties with Iraq.

[10] Research Terrorism, *What is terrorism?*. http://www.terrorism-research.com.

[11] Ibid.

[12] Kaminski Slawomir, *Polska w miedzynarodowej koalicji przeciwko terroryzmowi (eng. Poland in international anti-terrorism coalition)*, (Bezpieczenstwo Narodowe, Feb 2006), 169.

[13] Statement by the President of Poland, Aleksander Kwasniewski, in Connection with Terrorist Attacks in the United States on 11 September 2001 (Warsaw, September 11, 2001)

[14] UN Charter, Article 1 of Chapter 1.

[15] *The International Convention for the Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism* is on its legislative line in Polish parliment.

[16] Decision of the President of Poland, *Employment of Polish Armed Forces in missions abrod.* November 22, 2006. (http://www.bbn.gov.pl/?lin=3&last=158).

[17] Data taken from Public Opinion Research Center (CBOS) http://www.cbos.pl

[18] Ibid.

[19] Ibid.

[20] *Strategia Bezpieczenstwa Narodowego Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej (National Security Strategy of the Republic of Poland).* (Warsaw, 2003), 1.

[21] Ibid, 11.

[22] Chambris Alix, *Czy Polska jest koniem trojańskim Ameryki w Europie? (Is Poland an American Trojan Horse in Europe?),* (Polska w Europie 3/2004), 89. (www.pwe.org.pl/)

[23] Maly Rocznik Statystyczny Polski 2005. www.stat.gov.pl/opracowania_zbiorcze/ maly_rocznik_stat/2005/index.htm

[24] Calka Marek, *Terroryzm w Rosji, implikacje dla Unii Europejskiej i Polski (Terrorism in Russia, implications for European Union and Poland),* (Polska w Europie 3/2004), 141. (www.pwe.org.pl/)

[25] Karwala Damian, Nowa Strategia Bezpieczeństwa Narodowego Rzeczypospolitej (New National Security Strategy of the Republic of Poland), http://www.stosunki.pl/ main428346040410,4,yisvp.htm?PHPSESSID=f967aa02956647d83df054bc83f9ee9f